

EXHIBIT 19

REDACTED

Message

From: [REDACTED]@google.com]
Sent: 3/24/2015 3:58:57 PM
To: [REDACTED]@google.com]
Subject: Re: external and internal comms for RPO

Made a small suggestion. Otherwise, looks good.

I think an email notice to [REDACTED] makes sense as a final confirmation. I'd suggest phrasing it as a "hey, we're excited and ready to go to GA" note rather than an ask for permission.

[REDACTED]

On Tue, Mar 24, 2015 at 10:49 AM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Thanks [REDACTED], I've updated the comms doc a bit, let me know if it looks ok, or feel free to edit.

I think we are good to move forward on this - I think a heads up to the VPs as well before we move ahead?

On 23 March 2015 at 21:29, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
I think this is a much better comms process.

I also think we should refer to RPO as an Auction Quality enhancement. It's not that we can't call it RPO but that we always refer to it as the "Auction Quality RPO" enhancement.

On Mon, Mar 23, 2015 at 6:42 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
Hey [REDACTED],

Thanks for reviewing the comms doc, was working on agreement within comms team before circling back. I think it could be good to position this as a series of Auction Quality changes, in line with what we announced in August last year. With [REDACTED] team and the buy side comms folks ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] from PR, we came up with this basic plan:

- no external announcement
- when it is noticed externally (likely), we use the non-specific language in the comms doc (we don't say we are optimizing reserves specifically)
- launch message and comms doc goes to sales specialists only (not AMs), they pass it on reactively if there are questions
- TAMs/gtech briefed ahead of launch, debugging dashboard available for per-pub and buyer impact (spreadsheet form here)

Does that sound ok to you?

Do you think we should avoid called it RPO even in the internal comms doc? There is fairly widespread knowledge of the project already and a little concerned that it may bring up lots of questions if we don't specify what the launch does internally, at least for the product specialists.

Thanks!

[REDACTED]

On 12 March 2015 at 18:38, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

Fun one.

I think there are a few options:

- 1) say nothing, reactive comms only - simpler, falls into the idea of show me don't tell me. The risk is that buyers get wind of this and are upset. Could create churn with pubs as well.
- 2) introduce the concept of auction quality - more complicated, but gives us headroom for when we launch DRS.
- 3) market RPO specifically. - a lot of work that we then need to re-work for each release.

I think we should consider #2. My reasoning is that 1) this change should be noticed, 2) it saves us from advertiser claims that we didn't let them know / weren't transparent and 3) sets us up for not needing to do much in subsequent auction enhancements.

The messaging can be simple and generic. Along the lines of: we are working on multiple changes to the exchange's auction dynamics to improve ad quality and yield. The first of these ongoing changes is being rolled out and is expected to have a modest boost to your revenue. We will continue to rollout more of these changes over time.

Thoughts?

On Mar 12, 2015 4:17 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

[REDACTED] - now that we have approval, we could launch RPO as soon as Monday, I'm working on comms with sales. Wanted to get your take on the overall approach though: we are leaning towards reactive internal only, meaning we don't announce to pubs (at least not for a while), and don't pro-actively tell all of PBS it's going out. This will allow us to measure the impact and give us time to formulate a more marketing focused message on the impact later. What do you think?

Thanks,

[REDACTED]